

Application No.: 10/667,606**Docket No.: 713-886****REMARKS**

By Official Action mailed *November 2, 2005*, restriction to one of the following inventions is required:

- Group I:** Claims 1-3, 7 and 13, drawn to an explosively actuated tool, classified in class 29, subclass 798.
- Group II:** Claims 4-6, drawn to a cap, classified in class 220, subclass 200.
- Group III:** Claims 9-12, drawn to a method of assembling an explosively actuated tool, classified in class 29, subclass 434.
- Group IV:** Claim 14, drawn to a firing mechanism, classified in class 227, subclass 9.

In response, Applicants hereby elect Group I, upon which claims 1-7 and 13 are readable.

Because original claims 4-6 have been amended to depend on claim 1, Invention II is no longer claimed in the instant application.

The requirement for restriction between Invention I and Invention III is traversed, because the Examiner has failed to specified why the hypothetical process mentioned in paragraph 3 of the Restriction Requirement is materially different from the claimed process.

The requirement for restriction between Invention I and Invention IV is traversed,

Application No.: 10/667,606**Docket No.: 713-886**

because the Examiner has failed to show that the Inventions are distinct. The Examiner alleges that the combination, i.e., Invention I, does not require the spring to be locked into a housing. Applicants submit that the subcombination, i.e., Invention IV, neither requires the same. It is the mounting, rather than the spring, that is locked to a housing, and both Invention I and Invention IV require this particular. Applicants respectfully submit that the combination, i.e., Invention I, requires all particulars of the subcombination, i.e., Invention IV. *See, e.g.,* the last two paragraphs of claim 13 and claim 14. Therefore, claims drawn to Invention I and Invention IV should be examined together.

The requirement for restriction between Invention III and Invention IV is traversed, because the Inventions are not related as process of making and product made as specified in the Restriction Requirement. The product being made by the process of Invention III is a tool, i.e., Invention I, rather than a firing mechanism, i.e., Invention IV.

In view of the above, withdrawal of the Restriction Requirement and consideration of all claims pending in the instant application are believed appropriate and therefore courteously solicited.

Early examination on the merits is respectfully requested.

Application No.: 10/667,606Docket No.: 713-886

To the extent necessary, a petition for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. 1.136 is hereby made. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this paper, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account 07-1337 and please credit any excess fees to such deposit account.

Respectfully submitted,

LOWE HAUPTMAN & BERNER, LLP


Benjamin J. Hauptman
Registration No. 29,310

USPTO Customer No. 22429
1700 Diagonal Road, Suite 310
Alexandria, VA 22314
(703) 684-1111 BJH/KL/klb
(703) 518-5499 Facsimile
Date: December 2, 2005

CERTIFICATION OF FACSIMILE TRANSMISSION
I HEREBY CERTIFY THAT THIS PAPER IS BEING FACSIMILE TRANSMITTED
TO THE PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE ON THE DATE SHOWN BELOW

Kindra Bryant
TYPE OR PRINT NAME OF PERSON SIGNING CERTIFICATION


SIGNATURE

December 2, 2005
DATE

571-273-8300
FACSIMILE NUMBER